



**MCI Telecommunications
Corporation**

1801 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20006
202 867 3037

Amy G. Zirkle
Senior Manager
Federal Regulatory Affairs

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

EX PART, OR LATE FILED

EX PARTE

March 15, 1996

Mr. William Caton
Secretary
Federal Communications Commission
Room 222
1919 M Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20554

RECEIVED

MAR 15 1996

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF SECRETARY

Re: CC Docket No. 95-116: Local Number Portability

Dear Mr Caton:

Pursuant to Section 1.200 of the Federal Communications Commission's Rules, MCI is submitting two copies of the attached letter and accompanying attachments to be included in the record of the above-captioned proceeding.

Sincerely,

Amy G. Zirkle

No. of Copies rec'd _____
List ABCDE

022



**MCI Telecommunications
Corporation**

1801 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20006
202 887 3037

Amy G. Zirkle
Senior Manager
Federal Regulatory Affairs

EX PARTE

March 15, 1996

Mr. William Caton
Secretary
Federal Communications Commission
Room 222
1919 M Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20554

Re: CC Docket No. 95-116: Local Number Portability

Dear Mr Caton:

Pursuant to Section 1.200 of the Federal Communications Commission's Rules, MCI is submitting two copies of the attached letter and accompanying attachments to be included in the record of the above-captioned proceeding.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Amy G. Zirkle". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

Amy G. Zirkle



**MCI Telecommunications
Corporation**

1801 Pennsylvania Ave., NW
Washington, DC 20006
202 887 2601

Donald F. Evans
Vice President
Federal Regulatory Affairs

March 15, 1996

Ms. Regina Keeney
Chief, Common Carrier Bureau
Federal Communications Commission
1919 M Street N.W., Room 500
Washington, D.C. 20554

Re: Number Portability CC Docket 95-116

Dear Ms. Keeney:

One of the responsibilities of the FCC under the Telecommunications Act of 1996 is to ensure local number portability "without impairment of quality, reliability, or convenience when switching from one telecommunications carrier to another." The FCC has already started in this direction when it instituted this proceeding. During the pendency of this proceeding, the industry has continued to define a long-term solution to local number portability (LNP). MCI believes there is now consensus as to that long-term solution. The solution is known by the industry as Location Routing Number (LRN).

In a recent evaluation of several number portability proposals, the Selection Committee established as part of the Georgia Public Service Commission Docket No. 5840-U voted LRN the long-term database solution to LNP. I have attached the Selection Committee's Report to the Georgia Commission which clearly demonstrates the superiority of LRN to other proposals.¹

In its recent Order in Docket No. 5840-U, the Georgia Commission determined that LRN be implemented by a date certain, specifically June 1997, Illinois has supported this date as well. I have attached a copy of the Georgia Order. Given the Georgia Order and the Selection Committee report citing the commitments of several switch vendors to have LRN applications available by the second quarter of 1997, MCI believes a date certain implementation for local number portability is achievable.

¹MCI had voted for a two-phase approach with Carrier Portability Code (CPC) as the first phase and LRN, the long-term solution, as the second phase. This in no way should be construed that MCI does not fully support LRN as the long-term solution to LNP

Ms. Regina Keeney

Page 2


March 15, 1996

The FCC should adopt the database solution LRN and should establish a date certain for implementation. Switch vendors have stated that LRN can be available by mid-1997 (Georgia Number Portability, Docket No. 5840-U, Selection Committee Report to the Georgia Public Service Commission, January 8, 1996, p. 13). In order to meet this date, there must be clear objectives and milestones for evaluating the status of implementation (as was the case with 800 number implementation, 888 number deployment, and found recently by the Georgia Public Service Commission, Docket No. 5840-U, Order, p.6).

According to Section 251 (e)(2) of the Telecommunications Act, local number portability costs "shall be borne by all telecommunications carriers on a competitively neutral basis." Congress has determined that LNP is required to foster local competition bringing benefits to all customers. Therefore, LNP costs should not be borne disproportionately by only those customers porting numbers. The most practical and fair way for LNP costs to be shared proportionately by all providers of local exchange service and their customers is for all providers to recover their own network implementation costs from their subscribers. This cost recovery principle must apply both to interim and long-term LNP solutions.

In conclusion, it is the view of MCI that a long-term number portability solution should be adopted as quickly as possible. We find that LRN, a database solution, recently adopted by the Georgia Public Service Commission, to be the best way to ensure true local number portability. Implementation of LRN should occur at a date certain. It is feasible to implement LRN by the second quarter of 1997 as supported by the Georgia Selection Committee Report. Finally, the Commission must ensure that cost recovery for LNP be done on a competitively neutral basis.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Donald F. Evans".

Donald F. Evans

attachment(s)

cc: Mr. Richard Metzger

Mr. Richard Welch

Mr. Dave Baker, Chairman, Georgia Public Service Commission (w/o attachments)




COMMISSIONERS:

DAVE BAKER, CHAIRMAN
ROBERT B. (BOBBY) BAKER
MAC BARBER
BOB DURDEN
STAN WISE

WILLIAM J. DOVER
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR
TERRI M. LYNDALL
EXECUTIVE SECRETARY

Georgia Public Service Commission

244 WASHINGTON STREET SW
ATLANTA, GEORGIA 30334-5701
(404) 656-4501 OR 1 (800) 282-5813



DOCKET NO. 5840-U

**IN RE: Local Telephone Number Portability Under Section 2 of the
Telecommunications Competition and Development Act of 1995**

Record Submitted: February 7, 1996

Decided: February 20, 1996

APPEARANCES

On Behalf of The Commission Staff:

Nancy Gibson, Office of the Attorney General
David L. Burgess, Director, Rates and Tariffs

On Behalf of Consumers' Utility Counsel:

Bill Atkinson, Attorney
Joann Berry, Attorney

On Behalf of AT&T Communications of the Southern States, Inc. :

Roxanne Douglas, Attorney

RECEIVED

FEB 29 1996

Executive Secretary
Ga. Public Service Commission

On Behalf of BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc. :

Thomas Alexander, Attorney
William Ellenberg, Attorney

On Behalf of Airtouch Cellular of Georgia and Airtouch Paging:

Charles Gerkin, Attorney

On behalf of AT&T Wireless PCS, Inc., Georgia Public Communications Assoc., Inc.,

Southern Directory Company:

Newton Galloway, Attorney

On Behalf of Cable Television Association of Georgia :

Laura Nix, Attorney

On Behalf of BellSouth Mobility/BellSouth Personal Communications, Inc. :

Michael Bradley, Attorney

On Behalf of Cox Enterprises, Inc. :

Margaret Fernandez

On Behalf of Georgia Telephone Association :

Stephen Kraskin, Attorney

On Behalf of LDDS Worldcom :

John Stuckey, Attorney

On Behalf of MCI Telecommunications Corporation :

David Adelman, Attorney
Michael J. Henry

On Behalf of MediaOne :

L. Craig Dowdy, Attorney

On Behalf of Sprint Communications :

Carolyn Roddy, Regulatory

BY THE COMMISSION:

The Georgia Public Service Commission ("Commission") is charged with implementing and administering Georgia's new Telecommunications and Competition Act of 1995 (Section 2 of S.B. 137), O.C.G.A. § 46-5-160 *et seq.* (hereafter "the Act") . As a part of this responsibility, the Commission shall establish the framework for the implementation and administration of portability of local telephone numbers.

Under O.C.G.A. § 46-5-162(13), 'portability' means the technical capability that permits a customer to retain the same local telephone number at the same customer location regardless of the provider of the local exchange service. The Act at O.C.G.A. § 46-5-170 also provides that all local exchange companies shall make the necessary modifications to allow portability of local numbers between different certificated providers of local exchange service as soon as reasonably possible after such portability has been shown to be technically and economically feasible and in the public interest. Pursuant to O.C.G.A. § 46-5-168(b)(10), the Commission's jurisdiction includes the authority to direct telecommunications companies to make investments and modifications necessary to enable portability.

In order to facilitate the implementation of a permanent number portability solution in Georgia, in its Administrative Session on August 12, 1995, the Commission voted to sponsor a series of Number Portability Workshop meetings. The stated mission of the Workshop process was to:

"Obtain information and industry consensus to the extent possible on the necessary modifications to allow number portability as soon as reasonably possible, technically and economically. Also, obtain information and industry consensus to the extent feasible on access to local telephone number resources and assignments, recognizing the scarcity of such resources and adopted national assignment guidelines and Commission rules."

At the end of the workshop sessions three working subgroups were formed to continue evaluating potential portability solutions and identifying the critical issues regarding implementation of a recommended solution. On October 5, 1995, the Commission Staff issued a set of Number Portability Guidelines which further defined the scope and priorities for deployment of number portability in Georgia. In addition, the Staff recommended the formation of a voluntary Selection Committee with appropriate representation from all industry segments. On November 7, 1995, the Commission provided further guidance to the Selection Committee when it issued a Notice of Proposed Rulemaking identifying among other things, the service quality and reliability requirements of a mid-term to long-term number portability solution.

The Selection Committee was asked to evaluate the technical, cost, and implementation impacts of each potential call model proposal, and to make a recommendation to the Commission on the best call model for implementation in Georgia. Membership on the Selection Committee included BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc., AT&T Wireless Services, Airtouch Cellular, MFS Intelenet, MediaOne, Standard Telephone Company/Georgia Telephone Association, Sprint Communications, GTE Mobilnet, AT&T of the Southern States, Inc., MCI Metro/MCI Telecommunications and BellSouth Mobility.

On January 8, 1996, the Selection Committee submitted its report to the Commission (See Georgia Number Portability <Docket No. 5840-U> Selection Committee Report to the Georgia Public Service Commission, Attached hereto as Appendix A) outlining its recommendations for the selection of a permanent long term number portability solution and its associated implementation plan. On February 7, 1996, the Commission held a public hearing regarding the Selection Committee Report. Several parties provided testimony detailing the recommendations contained in the report and the necessary time frame for Commission action.

**FINDINGS OF FACT, CONCLUSIONS OF LAW
AND DECISIONS OF REGULATORY POLICY**

Based on the Selection Committee Report and the entire record in this proceeding, including those matters incorporated by reference, the Commission hereby renders the following findings of facts, conclusions of law, and decisions of regulatory policy:

1.

Jurisdiction is proper with the Commission and the Commission has authority to render a decision in this matter pursuant to O.C.G.A. § 46-5-168 (b)(10).

2.

The Commission finds that AT&T's Local Routing Number (LRN) is recommended by the Selection Committee as the permanent long-term call model for database number portability in Georgia. This recommendation was supported unanimously by the Selection Committee with the caveats identified in the report (See Georgia Number Portability <Docket No. 5840-U> Selection Committee Report to the Georgia Public Service Commission, Section 2.5. Selection Committee Vote, Page 9, Appendix A).

3.

The Commission finds that the Selection Committee identified two implementation plan options; Option #1:LRN only implementation, and Option #2: Carrier Portability Code (CPC) to LRN implementation. The LRN only option provides that LRN be implemented as soon as it becomes fully available, which is currently planned for the June, 1997 time frame. The CPC to LRN option recommends the implementation of the CPC solution, as soon as it becomes available, which is currently planned for the March, 1997 time frame. CPC would then be transitioned to LRN as soon as it becomes available.

4.

The Commission finds that Option #1, LRN only, is supported by eight of the nine committee members voting. AT&T and MFS supported this option with caveats. MCI Metro is the only committee member voting for Option #2, CPC to LRN (See Georgia Number Portability <Docket No. 5840-U> Selection Committee Report to the Georgia Public Service Commission, Section 3.1. Selection Committee Vote, Page 12, Appendix A).

5.

The Commission finds that evidence is contained in the record which demonstrates there would be no significant tangible benefit derived from implementing an interim database solution (CPC) prior to implementing the permanent long term solution (LRN). There would be minimal advance in the deployment schedule (March, 1997 versus June, 1997); additional implementation cost incurred (which have not been quantified); and CPC has remaining technical deficiencies (support for CLASS features).

6.

The Commission finds that the Selection Committee unanimously recommends number portability be implemented on a phased-in basis in a manner determined jointly by the industry.

7.

The Commission finds that the Selection Committee unanimously recommends an implementation committee be established to project manage and work the issues associated with the implementation of database number portability in Georgia.

8.

The Commission finds that the Selection Committee unanimously recommends the Commission establish frequent checkpoints throughout the implementation process to evaluate the status of the effort, to make any required course corrections, and to ensure that the direction established remains the best course of action for Georgia.

9.

The Commission finds that the Selection Committee unanimously recommends that the industry work the cost recovery issues according to the process identified in the report.

WHEREFORE IT IS ORDERED that AT&T's Local Routing Number (LRN) proposal be selected as the permanent long-term call model for database number portability in Georgia.

ORDERED FURTHER, that Option #1, LRN only Implementation plan is adopted along with its associated target dates.

ORDERED FURTHER, that number portability be implemented on a phased in basis in a manner determined jointly by the industry.

ORDERED FURTHER, that an implementation committee be established to project manage and work the issues associated with the implementation of database number portability in Georgia.


ORDERED FURTHER, that the Commission establish frequent checkpoints throughout the implementation process to evaluate the status of the effort, to make any required course corrections, and to ensure that the direction established remains the best course of action for Georgia. The implementation committee shall submit a monthly status report to the Commission outlining all activities undertaken, milestones achieved, and highlight any deviations or modifications made to the proposed implementation plan. The first status report is due on April 1, 1996.


ORDERED FURTHER, that the industry work the cost recovery issues according to the process identified in the report.


ORDERED FURTHER, that a motion for reconsideration, rehearing, or oral argument or any other motion shall not stay the effective date of this Order, unless otherwise ordered by the Commission.


ORDERED FURTHER, that jurisdiction over this matter is expressly retained for the purpose of entering such further Order or Orders as this Commission may deem just and proper.

The above action by the Commission in Administrative Session on the 20th day of February, 1996.


Terri M. Lyndall
Executive Secretary


Dave Baker
Chairman


Date


Date

RECEIVED

JAN 16 1996

COMMISSIONERS

DAVE BAKER, CHAIRMAN
ROBERT B. (BOBBY) BAKER
MAC BARBER
BOB DURDEN
STAN WISE

Executive Secretary
Ga. Public Service Commission

WILLIAM J. DOVER
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR
TERRI M. LYNDALL
EXECUTIVE SECRETARY

Georgia Public Service Commission

244 WASHINGTON STREET S.W.
ATLANTA, GEORGIA 30334-5701
(404) 656-4501 OR (800) 282-5813


LETTER ORDER

TO: All Interested Parties


IN RE: DOCKET NO. 5840-U Telephone Number Portability

Please be advised that the Commission at its January 16, 1996 Administrative Session voted to schedule a hearing on the Selection Committee's Report to the Georgia Public Service Commission dated January 8, 1996. This public hearing will begin at 10 a.m. on Wednesday and Thursday, February 7-8, 1996. Any parties wishing to prefile testimony must be filed with the Commission's Executive Secretary on or before 4:00 p.m. on Monday, January 29, 1996.

The above by action of the Commission in Administrative Session on January 16, 1996


Terri M. Lyndall
Executive Secretary

DATE January 16, 1996


Dave Baker
Chairman

DATE Jan 16, 1996



COMMISSIONERS

DAVE BAKER, CHAIRMAN
ROBERT B. BOBB, BAKER
MAC BARBER
BOB BURDEN
STAN WISE

WILLIAM J. DOVER
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR
TERRILL LYNDALL
EXECUTIVE SECRETARY

Georgia Public Service Commission

244 WASHINGTON STREET, S.W.
ATLANTA, GEORGIA 30334-5701
(404) 656-4501 OR 1-800-282-5813

MEMORANDUM

DATE: January 17, 1996

TO: Interested Parties, Docket No. 5840-U: Number Portability

FROM: Ken Ellison *KE*
Assistant to the Director
Utilities Division

RE: Number Portability Solution Report

The Industry Number Portability Solution Selection Committee has submitted its report concerning its recommended Number Portability solution for Georgia. Your copy of this report is attached.

**Georgia Number Portability
(Docket No. 5840-U)**

**Selection Committee Report
to the
Georgia Public Service Commission**

January 8, 1996

Selection Committee Report

Outline

	<u>PAGES</u>
1.0 INTRODUCTION	3 - 5
2.0 SELECTION PROCESS	6 - 10
3.0 IMPLEMENTATION PLANS	11 - 19
4.0 IMPLEMENTATION PLANNING ISSUES	20 - 24
5.0 RECOMMENDATIONS	25 - 27
6.0 REQUESTED ACTION FROM THE COMMISSION	28
7.0 ATTACHMENTS	29

1.0 INTRODUCTION

As a result of the Telecommunications Competition and Development Act of 1995 (S.B. 137), the Georgia Public Service Commission opened Docket No. 5840-U and conducted an initial Number Portability workshop on August 16-17, 1995. The purpose of the Workshop was to investigate the deployment of local telephone number portability in Georgia. As stated by the staff, the mission of the Workshop process was to:

"Obtain information and industry consensus to the extent feasible on the necessary modifications to allow number portability as soon as reasonably possible, technically and economically. Also, obtain information and industry consensus to the extent feasible on access to local telephone number resources and assignments, recognizing the scarcity of such resources and adopted national assignment guidelines and Commission rules."

During the initial workshop session, presentations were made by industry members to bring the participants to a common understanding of the various issues and industry views of number portability. At the end of the initial workshop session on August 16-17, 1995, the formation of three subgroups was recommended:

1. Framework/Solution Evaluation Subgroup
2. Creation and Administration of the Service Management System (SMS) Subgroup
3. Solution Implementation Subgroup (to be formed to implement the selected proposal)

The Framework/Solution Evaluation Subgroup began reviewing and adapting existing frameworks from other states, including Illinois and Maryland, to meet the needs of Georgia. The framework document was to serve as a listing of necessary attributes required to deploy number portability in Georgia. The group recommended that the Commission Staff provide a set of working assumptions so that the underlying assumptions for the framework document could be defined.

On October 2, 1995, the Commission Staff issued a set of Number Portability Guidelines (See Attachment #1), which provided ten guidelines that were used to develop and evaluate the technical requirements of the framework document. The guidelines also further defined the scope and priorities for deployment of number portability in Georgia. In addition, the Staff recommended the formation of a voluntary Selection Committee with appropriate representation from industry segments.

The Selection Committee was asked to evaluate the technical, cost, and implementation impacts of each potential call model proposal, and to make a recommendation to the Commission on the best call model for implementation in Georgia. The call model proposals from each vendor were to be evaluated by the Selection Committee members for technical compliance against the framework attributes, and for relative impacts of cost and ease of implementation.

The output of the Selection Committee process would be a report to the Public Service Commission. The PSC Staff asked that this report be completed by January 8, 1996.

The Selection Committee membership was designed to represent broad coverage of the telecommunications industry in Georgia, including incumbent Local Exchange Carriers (LEC), Independent Exchange Carriers, Competitive LECs, Wireless Carriers, and Interexchange Carriers.

The membership of the Selection Committee changed slightly over time. The current Selection Committee members are as follows:

<u>Committee Members</u>	<u>Representing</u>
Ken Culpepper	BellSouth Telecommunications
John Giannella	AT&T Wireless Services
Paula Jordan	AirTouch Cellular
Pamela Kenworthy	MFS Intelenet
Neil Knight	MediaOne
Mike Nash	Standard Telephone Company and Georgia Telephone Assn.
Ron Havens	Sprint
Bill Reimer	GTE Mobilnet
Greg Terry	AT&T Communications
Woody Traylor	MCI Metro and MCI Telecommunications
Jennifer Welch	BellSouth Mobility

In addition, David Brevitz from Ostrander Consulting participated in all Selection Committee meetings as a representative from the Commission Staff. Neil

Knight served as chair of the Selection Committee. While Sprint was copied on all Selection Committee correspondence, they did not participate in the voting, the development of the Selection Committee recommendations, or the development of this report.

The Selection Committee meetings were open and other industry members attended and participated in the selection process. Their presence is noted on the attendance rosters for the various meetings. However, voting on call model selection and implementation was limited to the members shown above.

An SMS Subcommittee was formed to begin working the issues and business decisions involved in creating and operating a neutral third party ported number administrative system. The membership of the SMS Subcommittee was also voluntary and was designed to include appropriate technical expertise on this issue from the Industry. Membership of the SMS Subcommittee is as follows:

<u>Committee Members</u>	<u>Representing</u>
Dennis Davis	BellSouth Telecommunications - Chair
Frank Holleman	BellSouth Telecommunications
Steve Addicks	MCI Metro
Fred Fletcher	BellSouth Telecommunications
Neil Knight	MediaOne
Bobby Smith	AT&T
Debbie Cook	AT&T

Other participants from the companies identified above were involved in some of the meetings.

On November 7, 1995, the Georgia Public Service Commission issued a Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (Docket No. 5840-U) on "Consideration of Rule Concerning Local Number Portability pursuant to the Telecommunications and Competition Development Act of 1995."

Given this guidance from the PSC and the PSC Staff, the Selection Committee began the evaluation and selection process for the mid-to-long term call model for number portability.

2.0 SELECTION PROCESS

2.1 Overview

The responsibilities of the Selection Committee as defined by the GPSC Staff were to recommend the number portability solution for Georgia and to present that recommendation to the GPSC via a report on January 8, 1996. The selection of the number portability solution was to include the recommendation for a number portability call model, plus an implementation plan. It was hoped that the recommended solution could be implemented by the fourth quarter of 1996. The Selection Committee was to develop the recommendation by consensus.

The Selection Committee identified three major areas of focus that would impact the selection of a number portability call model:

- Technical
- Implementation
- Cost

Each of these areas was addressed in the evaluation of the various number portability alternatives. The process followed by the Selection Committee to recommend a mid-to-long term number portability solution was to:

- a) issue a Request For Information (RFI) to the industry to receive number portability proposals
- b) evaluate the technical, implementation and cost issues associated with each proposal
- c) develop consensus on a recommended call model, and then address the implementation planning effort that would be required

These major activities are briefly reviewed below.

2.2 Request For Information

The Selection Committee developed the Georgia LNP (Local Number Portability) Framework Document which was distributed by the Commission Staff (see Attachment #2). This document identified the attributes that were most important for a number portability solution for Georgia. The Selection Committee used the Illinois Framework document as the initial base document. This document was modified based on input from the Maryland and California efforts, plus the input and requirements of the Selection Committee members. Technical, implementation and cost questions were included in the document. The Framework document was formatted with a Wireline section, developed primarily by the wireline service providers on the Selection Committee, and a Wireless section, developed by the wireless service providers on the Selection Committee.

The RFI was distributed to the following companies:

- | | | | |
|--------|----------------|----------------|----------|
| - AT&T | - MCI Metro | - Pacific Bell | - Nortel |
| - GTE | - U.S. Intelco | - Sprint | |

These companies were selected because of their industry involvement in number portability solution proposals. In addition, the RFI was announced in the Telecommunications Report, dated October 16, 1995.

The Selection Committee received responses to the RFI from the following companies (copies of the responses are included in the Archive Copy of the Selection Committee work):

- AT&T (Location Routing Number - LRN)
- MCI Metro (Carrier Portability Code - CPC)
- GTE (Non-Geographic Number)
- U.S. Intelco (Local Area Number Portability - LANP)
- Pacific Bell (Release To Pivot - RTP)
- ITN

2.3 Evaluation of Each Proposal

Prior to receiving the RFI responses from the proponent companies, the Selection Committee developed the weighting factors for each of the attributes addressed in the RFI. The following weightings were used (see Attachment #3):

- M = Mandatory, meaning that if the attribute is a "must-have", and if it is not met, the proposal may be eliminated from further consideration
- 3 = Critical to have
- 2 = Very Important
- 1 = Important

Each respondent was invited to present their proposal to the Selection Committee on November 6th and 7th. AT&T, MCI Metro, GTE, and U.S. Intelco made presentations. Pacific Bell and ITN did not make presentations.

Following the presentations, the Selection Committee developed some additional follow-on questions, primarily focused on the wireless issues, which were sent to each company that responded to the RFI. Responses to the questions were received from AT&T, MCI Metro, and GTE. U. S. Intelco, Pacific Bell and ITN did not respond.

2.4 Selection Committee Voting Process and Results

On December 5, 1995, the Selection Committee met to score each proposal and to develop a recommended number portability call model. Following is a summary of the information provided at the meeting.

The format for scoring the Framework Document was reviewed. The following ground rules were discussed:

- a. Only Selection Committee members would provide their scores.
- b. Technical experts from various proponent companies were invited to provide technical clarifications and to respond to questions, but were not to question why certain scores were received.

- c. Once a Section was scored, any significant/noted differences in scoring would be discussed for clarification to ensure a good technical understanding of the issues by all Selection Committee members.
- d. A Selection Committee member's score will be based on a technical evaluation of the response, plus the benefits the call model would bring to each individual carrier's network. It was felt that if the score were a pure technical evaluation, that there would be no significant differentiators in the scores, since all the responses to the framework document were virtually "fully compliant". Therefore, the implementation impacts on a company were included in the initial score, as appropriate.
- e. Since the individual Sections were not weighted/evaluated against each other, the comparison of scores within individual Sections was more important than a bottom line total score for all Sections.
- f. The wireline questions would be voted on by the wireline companies, and the wireless questions would be voted on by the wireless companies.

The Selection Committee discussed the appropriateness of scoring the ITN proposal. Since there was not a point by point response to the Framework document, there was no presentation by ITN during the November 6-7 meetings, and since ITN had indicated that they were not going to have any additional involvement in the Georgia effort, the Selection Committee decided not to score the ITN proposal and to eliminate it from further consideration.

The Selection Committee discussed the appropriateness of scoring Pacific Bell's Release-To-Pivot proposal. After some discussion, it was decided that the wireline companies would record the scoring for the RTP proposal since Pacific Bell had responded to the Framework Document and each wireline Selection Committee member had already completed their individual scoring of RTP. It was decided that the wireless companies would not record the scoring for the RTP proposal, since the majority of the wireless companies had not completed individual scores for RTP, due to the fact that no presentation was made and no response was received to the follow-on questions.

2.4 a. Technical Requirements

The Selection Committee provided their scores for each Section of the Georgia Framework document, as indicated on Attachment #4. Note that the wireless company scores were based on the assumption that they would be porting numbers in and out of their networks.

The Selection Committee discussed the Mandatory Items, and reviewed the working assumption that failure to meet a Mandatory Item meant that the solution *may* be eliminated from consideration. Following are the mandatory items and the results of the scoring:

Item 1F: Number Change Required:

All proposals were fully compliant and scored a 9 by all wireline Selection Committee members, except the GTE proposal, which

was scored a 0 by all Selection Committee members. (Note that this item was marked Mandatory in the November 2, 1995 Memorandum to the proponent companies, but that the follow-up Framework Document which included the weightings did not show it as mandatory, resulting in some confusion.)

Item 8: 911/E911 Impacts:

All proposals met this requirement, however, the LANP and GTE proposals were scored lower by some Selection Committee members due to the potential for confusion introduced by a dual number proposal.

Item 14A: Service Provider Portability:

All proposals were fully compliant and scored a 9 by all wireline Selection Committee members, except the GTE proposal, which was scored a 0 by all Selection Committee members.

Item 17: Patents/Licensing/Copyrights Impacts:

All proposals were fully compliant and scored a 9 by all wireline Selection Committee members, except the GTE proposal, which was scored a 0 by all Selection Committee members due to the potential of licensing fees.

2.4.b. Implementation Issues:

The Selection Committee then reviewed and discussed various implementation issues associated with each alternative, as summarized in Attachment #5. Subsequent to the December 5th - 6th meetings, the Selection Committee spent a considerable amount of time working the implementation issues, as summarized in Sections 3.0 and 4.0 of this Report.

2.4.c. Cost issues:

The opportunity to discuss cost issues was made available. MCI Metro briefly discussed information concerning the costs to transition from CPC to LRN. GTE indicated their concern that the Commission was not receiving sufficient cost data to make an informed decision. It was emphasized that each Selection Committee member had the responsibility to research the cost impacts of each solution on their respective networks, and to use that cost information in their evaluation and voting on the recommended proposal.

2.5. Selection Committee Vote

The Selection Committee was asked for their vote for the mid-to-long term number portability call model in Georgia. Prior to the vote, the Number Portability Guidelines document issued by the GPSC Staff, dated 10-2-95 were reviewed. Prior to the vote, BellSouth Mobility wanted to note for the record that their vote was based on the following caveats: 1) that their vote was a vote for a recommended solution if number portability is implemented, not a vote to implement number portability, 2) that an acceptable number portability

implementation plan is developed for Georgia, and 3) that an acceptable cost recovery plan is implemented.

The Selection Committee discussed the option of eliminating proposals prior to the vote. It was agreed that the ITN proposal was eliminated (see Section 2.4). The Selection Committee discussed the possibility of eliminating the GTE proposal since it did not meet three of the mandatory requirements. A vote was taken. All Selection Committee members except for GTE voted to eliminate the GTE proposal. Since the voting wasn't unanimous, the GTE proposal was not eliminated.

Following are the results of the Selection Committee voting:

Wireline Companies:

AT&T:	LRN, but if the LRN schedule is delayed significantly, they would advocate CPC as an interim solution
BellSouth:	LRN
MCI Metro:	CPC/LRN; based on the New York trial and the uncertainty of the LRN dates, they recommend CPC as an interim until LRN is available
MediaOne:	LRN
MFS:	LRN, but if the LRN schedule is delayed significantly, they would advocate CPC as an interim solution
Sprint:	Not present
Standard:	LRN

Wireless Companies:

AirTouch:	LRN
AT&T Wireless	LRN
BellSouth Mobility:	LRN (with caveats identified above)
GTE Mobilnet:	GTE

There was discussion on the CPC, LRN and GTE call models. After some discussion, GTE Mobilnet agreed to support LRN as the long term call model, if mandated by the GPSC. GTE expressed significant concerns on the costs of the LRN proposal and cost recovery. GTE plans to provide the GPSC with cost information.

The Selection Committee voted unanimously to recommend AT&T's LRN proposal as the long term permanent solution to implement in Georgia, with the caveats identified above.

With the consensus of LRN as the long term permanent call model, there was discussion concerning the implementation plan. Two scenarios were identified: an LRN only implementation, and a CPC to LRN implementation. The Selection Committee evaluated both implementation plans as discussed in Sections 3.0 and 4.0.

3.0 IMPLEMENTATION PLANS

This section addresses two aspects of the implementation of a database number portability solution. The first aspect is defining the type of database solution to implement. This is discussed in Sections 3.1. through 3.3.

The second aspect of defining an implementation plan for a database number portability solution deals with defining which specific areas in Georgia should be converted, and a conversion schedule. This is briefly discussed in Section 3.4.

3.1 Implementation Plan Overview

The Selection Committee identified two methods for implementing the recommendation of the AT&T LRN proposal as the mid-to-long term number portability call model for Georgia. This section will describe both implementation proposals, review how the Selection Committee members voted on the proposals, present the current timeline schedules for both proposals, and address some of the known risk factors and issues. In addition, each Selection Committee member was given the option of writing a summary of their individual position on both implementation plans. This information is contained in Attachment #6.

The Selection Committee realizes that the Commission Staff had hoped for a fourth quarter 1996 implementation of a number portability solution. However, in reviewing the implementation planning options, it became apparent that an acceptable solution could not be implemented in that time frame. The earliest time frame possible, with a very aggressive schedule for implementation, is expected to be the second or third quarter of 1997.

The two implementation plans evaluated by the Selection Committee are as follows:

A. Implement LRN:

This plan recommends the implementation of the LRN solution as soon as it becomes fully available, which is currently planned for the June, 1997 time frame.

B. Implement CPC as an interim step to LRN

This plan recommends the implementation of the CPC solution, which is based on the New York Trial, as soon as it becomes available, which is currently planned for the March, 1997 time frame. CPC would then be transitioned to LRN as soon as it becomes available.

As a point of clarification, the New York trial version of CPC is not a full field grade product, with all of the billing and feature functionality issues addressed. It is meant as an interim solution, built off the New York trial functionality, which